REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 2-5, 7, 14-17, and 19 have been cancelled by this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 are independent. The remaining claims dependent from claims 1, 8, and 13.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 4. Further, claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 have been amended to clarify the scope of the invention. Dependent claims 6 and 18 have been amended to be consistent with amendments made to independent claims 1 and 13, respectively. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, Figures 1-3 of the application. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned claims.

Drawings

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the originally filed drawings are acceptable.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-11, 13-15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,430,670 ("Bryg"). Claims 2-3, 5, and 14 have been cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. To the extent that this rejection applies to the pending amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 4. Cancelled claim 4 recited "setting the non-native page size." The Examiner has admitted that Bryg does not teach setting the non-native page size. *See* Office Action dated October 18, 2007, p. 5. In view of this, Bryg fails to disclose all the limitations of the amended independent claims. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 are patentable over Bryg. Pending dependent claims are patentable over Bryg for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 6-7[1], 9, 12, and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bryg in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,686 ("Earl"). Claims 4, 7, 16-17, and 19 have been cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. To the extent that this rejection applies to the pending amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

---

[1] Applicants note that claim 6 was not listed as rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 but was addressed under the rejection. In view of this, Applicants have included claim 6 in the responsive to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

MPEP § 2143 states that "[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit." Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner "must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference; …" MPEP § 2143(A).

Turning to the claimed invention, the claims are directed to a method and system for emulate non-native page sizes in the user-level of a system. More specifically, a user-level application may issue a call to the kernel, where the call is based on a non-native page size (*i.e.,* a page size different than the page size used by the underlying kernel). Prior to the call reaching the kernel, the call is intercepted by an interposing library. *See* Application, Figure 1. The interposing library, located in the user-level, is configured to modify the call such that it is dependent upon the native page size (*i.e.,* the page size being used by the underlying kernel). The modified call is subsequently sent to the kernel, where it is processed and a result is generated. The result, like the call, is intercepted by the interposing library and modified to be dependent upon the non-native page size. The modified result is subsequently sent to the user-level application. *See* Application, [0032]-[0038].

Thus, to the user-level application, the kernel is implementing the non-native page size and to the kernel the user-level application is implementing the native page size. Thus, the user-level application and the kernel application may be implemented using their respective different page sizes without any modification to either the kernel or the user-level application.

Turning to the rejection, claim 6 depends from amended independent claim 1, claims 9 and 12 depend from amended independent claim 8 and claims 18 depends from amended independent claim 13. The Examiner has admitted that all the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 8, and 13 are not taught or suggested by Bryg. Further, neither Bryg nor Earl teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20. In fact, both Bryg and Earl are directed to modification of the operation of the underlying hardware to address various issues related to the operation of the TLB without any teaching or suggestion of an interposing library configured to provide the functionality recited in the amended independent claims.

Specifically, Bryg is directed to modifying the operation of the TLB using a virtual hash page table. *See* Bryg, Abstract and Figure 3. Similarly, Earl is directed to modifying the TLB to store a mapping between an emulated virtual address and a corresponding physical address. *See* Earl, Figure 9.

In view of the above, amended independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 are patentable over Bryg and Earl. Pending dependent claims are patentable over Bryg and Earl for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

      Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/361001; SUN040137).

Dated: January 18, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
     Robert P. Lord
     Registration No.: 46,479
     OSHA · LIANG LLP
     1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
     Houston, Texas 77010
     (713) 228-8600
     (713) 228-8778 (Fax)
     Attorney for Applicant

314192_1